



Figure 8 Edmonds Ruins, ground plan.



Aidan Challis

Figure 9 Phase 1 interior: west wall, northern end, 1992.

wall west of the doorway (phase 2) is a clear eastward addition beyond the south-east corner quoins of the 750 mm wall (phase 1) and is not bonded in (see Figure 8). On the north side of the building, the 750 mm and 500 mm outside wall sections can be seen to abut, particularly when viewed from the top. The priority of the wall to the west (phase 1) is confirmed by the structural dependence upon it of the narrower wall to the east (phase 2) which has been built up against it. (The cavity wall structure of phase 2 in this area is discussed further below.) The presence of general exterior plastering on the 750 mm but not on the 650-400 mm walls suggests the priority of the thicker walls. The poorer phase 2 walls could be considered more in need of protective or cosmetic treatment, and the lack of exterior plaster on them suggests that they were absent at the time the plaster was applied to the heavier phase 1 masonry.

The surviving heights of the walls indicate that there were two gabled rooves, the western, over phase 1 structures, with an eaves height of 2.2 m, and the eastern, over phase 2 structures, with an eaves height of 2.0 m. There would have been two parallel roof apexes trending north to south with a gully between them (see Figure 4). The historic photograph (Figure 7) shows the roof on the eastern phase 2 structure to be shingled on untrimmed purlins without bargeboards, and with a timber box gutter. There is no increase in wall thickness for gable-end walls of greater height. On the contrary, the phase 2 north wall, which includes a chimney in the gable end to a height of 5 m (Figure 10), reduces to a thickness of 500 mm at the western and 400 mm at the eastern side.

Window places in both phase 1 and phase 2 structures have sections of narrower walling beneath, with associated angled internal reveals (Figure 9). The consequent alternation of short wall sections of differing thickness, not bonded together, has produced a weak structure. Dressed quoins around the phase 1 west wall windows, together with greater wall thickness, have assisted the survival of these walls despite the lack of bonding, but parts of the weaker phase 2 east wall sections have collapsed.

There are four exterior doorways, at three of which flagstone doorsteps survive. This rather large number of outside doors suggests more than one design phase.

There are two fireplace positions in the building:

- (1) In the phase 1 south room there is a large bread-oven structure (Figure 11), with a fireplace and flue to the east and addi-

tional masonry infilling on both sides. The oven is of the side flue type (no internal flue) as was used in commercial bakeries (internal dimensions 1200 X 780 mm with an arched roof 500 mm high, all in dressed basalt). The standard of stone dressing is high, suggesting that it was constructed before the death of Mr John Edmonds (1865). The door is missing but the door frame survives (Figure 29). On the outside of the phase 1 south wall, backing on to the oven, a slight bulge appears to be caused by pressure of unbonded masonry on the inside. The presence of an earlier fireplace on the inside of the wall is suggested. This, together with the apparent structural independence of the 750 mm walls from the oven structure, suggests that the oven, with the associated east side fireplace and west side infilling, are later additions in front of an original open fireplace and chimney. The chimney in the phase 1 south gable



Aidan Challis

Figure 10 Phase 2 interior: fireplace and chimney, north wall, 1992.



Aidan Challis

Figure 11 Bread oven structure, south-west room, 1992.

- end, still present in the early 1960s (Figure 4), has collapsed.
- (2) On the phase 2 north wall an open fireplace with a flagstone hearth survives (Figure 10). An internal wall cavity on the west side, opening out from a gap inside the chimney, might have been designed to circulate warmth. The chimney is not vertically sided, but has a pronounced batter. Decorative string-coursing is present above the roof level (Figures 7 and 10).

A section of interior wall, 350-300 mm thick, extends eastwards from the north side of the western outside door (shown as phase 1 on Figure 8). Although it is not bonded with the phase 1 outside wall, it is thought to be contemporary with it because of the comparable quality of the masonry and the equal 2.2 m height. A fragment of phase 2 interior wall also survives towards the north end of the north-south interior wall line (see Figure 8). Apart from these two fragments, other interior walls appear to have been built in 1983 during the programme of masonry repairs.

A structural sequence for Edmonds Ruins is therefore proposed. The western half of the main dwelling is believed to be the earliest on the site (phase 1, Figure 8). Originally, the intention may have been to complete a two-roomed house, exterior dimensions 12.5 m X 5.2 m. The north-west facing parts of the surviving phase 1 structure have the largest and best dressed stones, complete with external plaster. This suggests that the west was initially designed to be the front, and the west the main angle of approach. An apparent track of variable width approaches the site from the

west (see Figure 2). The northern room of the phase 1 house was the smaller, with an outside door in the north side wall, and the southern room was the larger, with a fireplace in the south wall and with the front door in the west wall. The interior was plastered. Part of the interior wall between the two rooms survives. Ceiling height was about 2.2 m, shown by the interior plaster height on the north wall. There was a simple gabled roof with an attic in the roofspace. The inner sides of the stone walls of both gable ends were plastered, suggesting that the attic was in regular use and that there may have been attic windows.

Building is thought to have commenced after 1840 (discussed above). It is suggested that the phase 1 structure was completed and lived in before it was added to, because of the wide range of structural differences between phase 1 and phase 2. However, it is odd that so little of the presumed phase 1 eastern outside wall has survived. Perhaps its stability was fatally compromised by being broken through for new doorways and by the cannibalising of stones for the phase 2 structure. Archaeological investigation along the wall line beneath the reconstructed 1983 structures may provide further clues.

The eastern half of the main dwelling is thought to be an addition (phase 2, Figure 8), for reasons already considered. It is thought to have been completed by 1858, because its dimensions appear to be incorporated in the size of the structure plotted on the survey of 1860 (Figure 5), and because no construction took place after 1858 when the proposal by the government to acquire the land was made known (Edmonds 1861). The eastern extensions doubled the size of the house (new exterior dimensions 12 m X 9.6 m), providing a further two rooms downstairs and additional attic space. The phase 2 extension had outside doors in the east (Figure 7) and south sides. Structural evidence shows three windows in the eastern wall, two of which are seen in the historic photograph to have had plain double-hung sash joinery (Figure 7). Continuous interior plaster across the west side of the chimney cavity structure of the phase 2 north room suggests a doorway into the phase 1 north room (see Figure 8). This doorway was later blocked. Plastering on the interior of the phase 2 north room extends to a height of about 2 m, comparable with the height of the surviving parts of the eastern walls, indicating the ceiling and eaves height. The attic was unplastered but had at least two dormer windows. In the historic photograph (Figure 7), one dormer window is seen to be a side-hinged casement, and cleats are present on the frame of the other as if for a shutter. Attic headroom would have been a maximum of 2 m. The roof line around the chimney is marked by mortar survivals.

With the extension, a second dividing wall may have been added to the phase 1 part of the house on the south side of the west door, making a back hall. This interior wall, partially rebuilt in 1983, covers original west wall interior plaster. Parts of the phase 1 rooms may have been replastered (e.g., the north eastern part of the phase 1 north room). The large oven in the south-west room is an addition to the phase 1 structure, and may be of the phase 2 period. This oven confirms the use of the south-west room as the kitchen, and suggests that the north-east room with its fireplace (Figure 10) became the best room. Therefore the phase 1 west side, originally the front, apparently became the back with the construction of phase 2, and the phase 2 east side became the front (Figure 7). Stone rows forming garden kerbing and paths are aligned in



Aidan Challis

Figure 12 The annexe structure from the north, 1992

relationship to the phase 2 east front (Figure 8). The historic photograph (Figure 7) shows a picket gate and a lightweight hurdle fence.

Immediately to the west of the main dwelling lie the ruined remains of the annexe (marked as phase 3 on Figure 8; see also Figure 12). This is generally an unmortared loose random rubble structure (Harris 1975: 416) with walls 700-900 mm thick. Some mortar is present around the window positions in the two end walls, evidence of the eastern reveals of which survive in each case (noted on Figure 8), and in what may have been a chimney to the west. This latter structure has walls 500-600 mm thick, unbonded with the rest of the annexe. It may have closed off an earlier doorway. It remains to a height of 1.8 m, greater than the rest of the annexe structure (1.4 m or less).

The annexe is thought to have been built after phases 1 and 2 of the main house were completed. The apposition of the annexe door to the western door of the phase 1 structure suggests that the annexe was designed to be used in conjunction with the main house and was therefore constructed before the fire of 1885 or 1886. Had the annexe been the first construction on the site, present when the better quality phase 1 structure was erected closely adjacent to it, it probably would have been demolished rather than allowed to compromise the new impression. It blocks off the best western side of the phase 1 structure, which may have been the first front, so it is likely that the annexe was built after the west side had become the back, after the phase 2 extensions. The